

California State University, Chico
General Education Scoring Guide for Critical Thinking

Scoring Level	OVERALL REASONING	SLO 5. Can distinguish between inductive reasoning and deductive reasoning	SLO 6. Can distinguish between truth and logic	SLO 7. Can determine whether a consideration is relevant	SLO 8. Can recognize questionable assumptions and missing information	SLO 9. Can evaluate the credibility of statements and sources	SLO 10. Can identify ambiguity, vagueness, and common fallacies in reasoning
3 - Accomplished	Subject successfully detects specious reasoning, irrelevancies, questionable assumptions, and missing information in the text. Responds to the author's arguments rather than to his or her rhetoric. Does not confuse truth with logic (e.g., does not agree with an argument merely because its conclusion is true or reject it as illogical merely because it contains a false statement).	Subject can successfully distinguish between deductive or inductive reasoning in the text under examination.	Subject does not confuse truth with logic, e.g., does not agree with an argument merely because its conclusion is true or reject it as illogical merely because it contains a false statement.	Subject can recognize relevant from irrelevant information in an argument and distinguish rhetoric from evidence.	Subject can recognize when questionable assumptions have been made in an argument or when information is inadequate to support the author's conclusions.	Subject can evaluate the credibility of sources, e.g., distinguish scholarly literature from popular literature, as well as evaluate the credibility of a statement, regardless of source.	Subject can identify ambiguous, vague and misleading passages in the text as well as recognize common fallacies in reasoning.
2 - Competent	Subject has only partial success in detecting specious reasoning, irrelevancies, questionable assumptions, and missing information in the text. Leaves evaluator unsure if he or she has been influenced more by the author's rhetoric than by his or her reasoning, or cannot distinguish between truth and logic.	Subject has only partial success in distinguishing between deductive and inductive reasoning in the text under examination.	Subject has only partial success in distinguishing between truth from logic, e.g. does not always clearly distinguish issues of sound reasoning from the truth or falsity of the statements comprising the argument.	Subject has only partial success in recognizing relevant from irrelevant information in an argument and distinguishing rhetoric from evidence.	Subject has only partial success in recognizing when questionable assumptions have been made in an argument or when information is inadequate to support the author's conclusions.	Subject has only partial success in evaluating the credibility of sources, e.g. distinguishing scholarly literature from popular literature, as well as evaluating the credibility of a statement, regardless of sources.	Subject has only partial success in identifying ambiguous, vague and misleading passages in the text or recognizing common fallacies in reasoning.
1 - Beginning	Subject fails to recognize specious reasoning, irrelevancies, questionable assumptions, or missing information (or sees problems where none exist). Seems more influenced by the author's rhetoric than by his or her reasoning; or seems unable to distinguish between truth and logic.	Subject fails to distinguish between deductive or inductive reasoning in the text under examination. No evidence that subject can clearly distinguish inductive versus deductive reasoning.	Subject confuses truth with logic, e.g. does not recognize the difference between sound reasoning and truth/falsity of statements.	Subject fails to recognize relevant from irrelevant information in an argument and can not distinguish rhetoric from evidence.	Subject fails to recognize when questionable assumptions have been made in an argument or when information is inadequate to support the author's conclusions.	Subject fails to recognize variation in the credibility of sources and is unable to distinguish credible from questionable statements.	Subject fails to identify ambiguous, vague and misleading passages in the text or recognize common fallacies in reasoning.